camphor, methyl salicylate, capsicum, croton oil, and turpentine incorporated in an ointment base.

The Cholax was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Pulvis Effervescens Sodii Phosphatis Comp.," appearing on the carton and label, was false and misleading since it represented that the product was an effervescing preparation of sodium phosphate; whereas it was an effervescing preparation of sodium phosphate, sodium sulfate, and magnesium sulfate. A second allegation of misbranding was that the statement "Containing * * * Lithia," appearing upon the label and in a circular contained in the package, was false and misleading since it represented that the article consisted of lithia; whereas it contained no appreciable amount of, if any, lithia. A third allegation of misbranding was that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent: (Carton) "Indicated in the treatment of Rheumatism, Gout, Uric Acid, Jaundice"; (bottle label) "Anti-Lithic, Anti-Rheumatic, Alterative, * * * For * * * Dizziness and Biliousness * * * as a laxative in Rheumatism, Gout, Jaundice, and affections of the Stomach, Liver and Kidneys"; (circular) "The Sparkling Stomach and Liver Salt * * * Cholax is indicated in the treatment of Rheumatism, Gout, Jaundice, Uric Acid conditions, * * * Nausea from various causes and affections of the stomach, liver and kidneys; in fact wherever a Uric Acid solvent, hepatic, stimulant, toxaemic, eliminant, gastric sedative * * * For its constitutional effect and as a gastric sedative"; and (leaflet) "Acts by stimulating the intestinal secretions necessary to a healthy digestion and regulating the liver, kidneys and the bowels in a natural manner."

The Pancreatone was alleged to be misbranded in that the designation "Pancreatone," appearing on the label, was false and misleading since it represented that the sole physiologically active ingredient of the article was pancreatin; whereas it contained other physiologically active ingredients, i. e., compounds of arsenic, manganese, and strychnine with pancreas and gentian. A further allegation of misbranding was that the label statements "Diabetes Mellitus" and "For diabetes mellitus, and all diseases of pancreatic origin" were statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of the article, and were false and fraudulent.

The Meth-O-Sol was alleged to be misbranded in that the name "Meth-O-Sol," appearing on the label, was false and misleading since it represented that the article contained methyl salicylate as its only active ingredient; whereas it contained methyl salicylate, camphor, croton oil, and turpentine oil as its active ingredients. A second allegation of misbranding was that the statement "Linimentum Camphorae Comp.," appearing in an accompanying circular, was false and misleading since it represented that the article was a liniment consisting of camphor as its active ingredient; whereas it was a liniment consisting of camphor, methyl salicylate, capsicum, croton oil, and turpentine oil as its active ingredients. A third allegation of misbranding was that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent: (Carton) "A Local Application For Congestion or Inflammation of the Lungs. Excellent in the Treatment of Pneumonia, Croup, * * * An Efficient Preparation For the alleviation of Rheumatism, Backache, Neuritis, Tonsilitis, and Enlarged Glands"; (label) "Recommended in the treatment of Neuritis, Rheumatism, Pleurisy, Lumbago, Backache, * * * Sciatica, or wherever there is pain"; (circular) "Methosol will be found an effective local application in Backache, Rheumatism, Lumbago, Sciatica, * * * Neuritis, Pleurisy, Incipient Pneumonia, Croup, Hoarseness, Sore Throat * * * relieving pain and stiffness of the muscles and joints."

On September 6, 1938, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

30612. Adulteration and misbranding of sutures. U. S. v. 26 Dozen Sutures (and 3 other seizure actions against the same product). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 44650, 44661, 44807, 44849. Samples Nos. 36527–D, 36528–D, 36530–D, 36547–D, 36548–D, 36549–D, 36878–D, 36879–D, 36904–D, 36905–D, 36906–D.)

This product had been shipped in interstate commerce and remained unsold and in the original packages. At the time of examination it was found to be contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

Between January 10 and February 15, 1939, the United States attorneys for the District of Kansas and the Western District of Oklahoma, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in their respective district courts

libels praying seizure and condemnation of 26 dozen sutures at Fort Scott, Kans., 94 dozen sutures at Halstead, Kans., and 24 dozen packages, each containing 1 dozen sutures, at Oklahoma City, Okla.; alleging that the article had been shipped within the period from on or about December 13, 1937, to on or about January 3, 1939, from St. Paul, Minn., by the Laboratory of the Ramsey County Medical Society; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, i. e., "Pyoktanin Catgut," which standard implies sterility; whereas the article was not sterile but was contaminated with viable micro-organisms.

Misbranding was alleged in that the label statement, "Pyoktanin Catgut * * * Directions: Tear the envelope and drop the contents into a sterile solution; soak the strand before application to make it pliable and to prevent breaking at the knot," was false and misleading since it created the impression that the article was sterile catgut suitable for surgical use; whereas it was contaminated with viable micro-organisms and was unsuitable for surgical use.

On March 22, March 30, and May 19, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

30613. Adulteration and misbranding of peroxide of hydrogen. U. S. v. 136 Bottles and 96 Bottles of Peroxide of Hydrogen. (F. & D. Nos. 44797, 44798. Sample Nos. 39812-D, 39813-D.)

This product contained less hydrogen peroxide than declared and did not conform strictly to United States Pharmacopoeia standards, as claimed.

On February 7, 1939, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 232 bottles of peroxide of hydrogen at Seattle, Wash.; alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about January 5, 1939, from Los Angeles, Calif., by Columbia Laboratories, Inc.; and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The 136 bottles were alleged to be adulterated in that the strength of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, i. e., "Active Ingred. H_2O_2 5.1%," since it contained less than 5.1 percent of hydrogen peroxide.

Misbranding of the 136 bottles was alleged in that the label statements, "Active Ingred. H_2O_2 5.1%" and "Made in Strict Conformance with the United States Pharmacopoeia Standards," were false and misleading, since the article contained less than 5.1 percent of hydrogen peroxide, and it was not made in strict conformance with the United States Pharmacopoeia standards in that the maximum tolerance for solution of hydrogen peroxide is 3.5 grams per 100 cubic centimeters, and this article contained more than 3.5 grams per 100 cubic centimeters.

The 96 bottles were alleged to be adulterated in that the strength of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, namely, "Active Ingredient Hydrogen Dioxide 6%," since it contained less than 6 percent of hydrogen dioxide.

Misbranding of the 96 bottles was alleged in that the label statement "Active Ingredient Hydrogen Dioxide 6%" was false and misleading, since the article contained less than 6 percent of hydrogen dioxide.

On April 27, 1939, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

30614. Misbranding of sweet spirit of nitre, peroxide of hydrogen, tincture of benzoin, spirit of camphor, and compound tincture of benzoin. U. S. v. The Ideal Laboratories, Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, $150. (F. & D. No. 42643. Sample Nos. 27245-D, 27251-D, 27484-D, 27491-D, 27494-D, 30408-D.)

These products were misbranded in the following respects: The sweet spirit of nitre and the spirit of camphor because they were labeled to indicate that they were pharmacopoeial products; whereas the sweet spirit of nitre contained ethyl nitrite in excess of the amount specified in the pharmacopoeia and the spirit of camphor contained less camphor than specified in that authority; the peroxide of hydrogen because it contained hydrogen peroxide in excess of the amount declared on the label; and the tincture of benzoin and compound